

|   |                        |                     |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |
|   | 10/661,376             | HAKASALO ET AL.     |
|   | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |
|   | Vineeta S. Panwalkar   | 2611                |

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(1) Vineeta S. Panwalkar

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Keith Obert.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 7 December 2007

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:**  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

4

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*Applicant's representative, Mr. Obert, agreed to an examiner's amendment to change the dependency of claim 4 so as to place the application in condition for allowance.*

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
Vineeta Panwalkar

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)